



ARKANSAS SECRETARY OF STATE
MARK MARTIN

July 13, 2018

Brian Newby, Executive Director
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
1335 East-West Highway, Suite 4300
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Newby:

Please accept this letter as a narrative for the Arkansas project to expend HAVA Funds out of the Office of Arkansas Secretary of State Mark Martin. The Secretary and citizens of Arkansas are deeply appreciative of the release of this funding and the efforts of the Election Assistance Commission in both obtaining and disbursing the funding to the states.

Arkansas began actively seeking to replace our current election systems in June of 2014 with an initial legislative hearing on issues related to elections in the fall of 2013. At the time of that hearing, 72 of the 75 counties in Arkansas were utilizing "Unityware" election equipment provided by Election Systems & Software (ESS) incorporating Ratal real-time audit logs. The three other counties utilized Hart Intercivic Schouptronic ELECTronic (DRE) voting systems. This equipment operated without the creation of a paper-trail.

This office recognized the necessity of ensuring our citizens were provided with safe, secure, and efficient elections. We issued a "request for proposals" for an integrated election equipment system to be delivered on a full county-by-county basis. Following the submission/review process, Secretary of State Mark Martin selected the system proposed by Election Systems and Software.

At that time, this office selected four counties to serve as pilot counties during the 2016 Primary Election. Based upon the success of these counties during that election, the pilot was expanded to an additional six counties.

Following the General Election of 2016, and based upon the outstanding success and acceptance of the new integrated election equipment systems, this office embarked upon an equipment purchase and distribution process established upon a 50/50 sharing of the costs between the county and this office. Funding from this office was derived through various cost saving measures undertaken in our yearly budgets. The first year of this new program, equipment was provided to the counties under the cost sharing program raising our total number of counties to 20. One county was so pleased with the results they elected to purchase the entire system through their own funding, bringing our total to 21 counties.



In the spring of 2018, this office realized additional savings in our yearly budget and prepared to expand our list of counties with the integrated election equipment systems. In cases where a county made a reduction in the number of voting locations, and a subsequent reduction in the amount of equipment needed by that county, this office offered 100% of that savings to the county. These savings opened up the possibility of a greater number of counties to achieve their match to the 50/50 program. With the expenditure of our available funding, we expanded the number of counties with the new system to 32 of our 75 counties.

With notification of the new HAVA funding, Secretary Martin determined the best method of ensuring safe, secure, and efficient elections for our citizens was to continue to replace the old equipment with the new integrated election equipment system. Specific emphasis was placed on ensuring the three counties lacking any ballot or paper trail be upgraded to the new systems. Each of these three counties were offered – and accepted – a proposal by this office to provide 100% funding of their equipment to ensure they could afford to have their equipment replaced. Following that acceptance, the remaining HAVA funding was offered to remaining counties who had as yet not upgraded their equipment on a 50/50 basis. We continued to couple this with an opportunity for each county to achieve additional savings on their portion through reductions in the equipment required.

Through utilization of the HAVA funding provided by the Election Assistance Commission, county contributions of varying amounts based upon their individual election requirements, and funding provided directly through this office, Arkansas has now expended \$22.985 million in 54 of our 75 counties. This has enabled, as of this date, over 1.2 million registered voters in this state the opportunity to vote on the new integrated election equipment system. This equates to approximately 68.8% of registered voters in Arkansas.

Again, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to you and the commission in helping us reach this significant milestone. Our intent is to continue with the process of delivery of new integrated election equipment systems to the remaining counties in an effort to achieve 100% delivery of safe, secure, and efficient elections for the citizens of Arkansas.

Sincerely yours,

Kelly Boyd
Chief Deputy Secretary of State



2018 HAVA ELECTION SECURITY GRANT

Budget Information

CFDA # 90.404

Non-Construction Program

Name of Organization:

Secretary of State, Arkansas

Budget Period Start:

3/23/2018

SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY

Budget Period End:

3/22/2021

FEDERAL & NON-FEDERAL FUNDS (Match)

*(Consolidated Budget for total project term--
up to 5 years as defined by grantee)*

PROGRAM CATEGORIES

BUDGET CATEGORIES	(a) Voting Equipment	(b) Election Auditing	(c) Voter Registration Systems	(d) Cyber Security	(e) Communications	(f) Other	(g) Other	TOTALS	% Fed Total
1. PERSONNEL (including fringe)								\$ -	0%
2. EQUIPMENT	\$ 4,475,015.00							\$ 4,475,015.00	100%
3. SUBGRANTS- to local voting jurisdictions								\$ -	0%
4. TRAINING								\$ -	0%
5. ALL OTHER COSTS								\$ -	0%
6. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (1-6)	\$ 4,475,015.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,475,015.00	
7. INDIRECT COSTS (if applied)		\$ -						\$ -	0%
8. Total Federal Budget	\$ 4,475,015.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,475,015.00	
11. Non-Federal Match	\$ 223,751.00							\$ 223,751.00	
12. Total Program Budget	\$ 4,698,766.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,698,766.00	
13. Percentage By Category	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	

Proposed State Match

5.0%

A. Do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government or some other non-federal entity?

No

If yes, please provide the following information:

B. Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (mm/dd/yyyy-mm/dd/yyyy):

C. Approving Federal agency:

D. If other than Federal agency, please specify:

E. The Indirect Cost Rate is: